DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 838 CG 026 021

TITLE School District and Interagency Collaborative Services for Students At Risk in Utah: A Report of On-Site Visits.
INSTITUTION Utah State Office of Education, Salt Lake City.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 66p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation; At Risk Persons; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *High Risk Students; Problem Solving; *Pupil Personnel Services; *School Districts; Secondary School Students; *Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS *Utah

ABSTRACT

During 1992, on-site visits were made to the 40 school districts in Utah to determine the current status of At Risk needs and services for students. This report describes the findings from those visits; many of the findings are reported in list form. Part 1 of this report focuses on school district services for students at risk. It presents district definitions of a "student at risk," district estimated percentages of such students, and district indicated age/grade levels of need. Conditions which may contribute to a student being at risk are identified in the areas of family-related conditions, socioeconomic factors, and conditions intrinsic to the student. Information also is reported on district indicated sources for referral for students at risk, district self-reports of programs that work, and components of successful programs. Other issues addressed in Part 1 include district reports of needs to be addressed, barriers to addressing needs, needs for assistance, and samples of district reports of at risk fund utilization. Part 2 focuses on interagency collaborative services for students at risk. Included are reports of interagency collaboration, lists of attributes of interagency collaborative efforts, lists of barriers to effective interagency collaboration, and reports of needed assistance from state level agencies and organizations. Part Three presents an agenda for problem solving. Suggestions are made for funding, promoting interagency collaboration, streamlining efforts, and empowering local efforts. Relevant materials and forms are appended. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CG

ED 363 838

School District and Interagency Collaborative Services for Students At Risk in Utah:

A Report of On-Site Visits

Students At Risk Consortium Leadership Team

Tom Hudson, Chair
Betty Brand
Karen Kowalski
Beverly Wilcox

Services for At Risk Students Utah State Office of Education

MaryAnn Williams, Specialist
Stevan J. Kukic, Director

Services for Students At Risk Advisory Council Executive Committee

Daryl Barrett, Chair
Rosalind McGee
Shirley Weathers

Utah State Office of Education
Scott W. Bean
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

October 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Raphael
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CG026021

Utah School District and Interagency Collaborative Services for Students at Risk:

A Report of On-Site Visits

October 1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part One--Report of On-Site Visits: School District Services for Students At Risk 1

District Definitions of a "Student At Risk" 1
District Estimated Percentages of "Students At Risk" 1
District Indicated Age/Grade Levels of Need 3
Conditions Which May Contribute To A Student Being At Risk Master Plan for Services for Students At Risk from Prevention through Remediation; August 19, 1988 3
Conditions Which May Contribute To A Student Being At Risk: Reports of Utah School Districts During On-Site Visits, 1992 4
Conditions Reported As Present in District School-Age Populations: Results of Utah School Districts On-Site Visits; 1992 (Reported by Area, Condition, and Number of Districts Indicating Presence) 7
Conditions Indicated as "Great Concern" By Districts for Their School-Age Populations: Reported by Highest to Lowest Frequency 9
District Indicated Sources for Referral for "Students At Risk" 11
District Self-Report of Programs That Work 11
District Reported Components of Successful Programs 24
District Reports of Needs To Be Addressed 27
District Indicated Barriers To Addressing Needs 29
District Reports of Needed USOE/Consortium Assistance 30
Samples of District Reports of AT Risk Fund Utilization 32

Part 2--Report of On-Site Visits: Interagency Collaborative Services for Students At Risk 34

Reports of Interagency Collaboration 34
Reported Attributes of Interagency Collaborative Efforts 34
Barriers to Effective Interagency Collaboration 36
Reported Needed Assistance From State Level Agencies/Organizations 37

Part 3--An Agenda for Problem Solving 38

Funding 38
Promoting Interagency Collaboration 39
Streamlining 41
Empowering Local Efforts 42
Summary 44

Appendix III
Descriptors of At Risk Conditions/Problems
District Interview Guide
Formal Interagency Interview Guide
Informal Interagency Interview Guide

INTRODUCTION

During the months of August and September, 1992, on-site visits were made to each school district in Utah to determine the current status of At Risk needs and services. Questionnaires and formats were developed through a joint effort of the At Risk Consortium Leadership Team, the Services for Students at Risk Advisory Council Executive Committee, and the Utah State Office of Education Services for At Risk Students Section (SARS) staff. This development group consisted of At Risk Consortium Leadership Team members: Tom Hudson, Nebo District, Chair; Betty Brand, Davis District, Urban Representative; Karen Kowalski, North Sanpete District, Rural Representative and Bev Wilcox, Ogden District, Past Chair. The Services for Students At Risk Advisory Council was represented by Executive Team members: Daryl Barrett, "You're in Charge" Program, Chair; Shirley Weathers, Utah Issues, Member; and Rosalind McGee, Utah Children, Member. Stevan Kukic, Director, At Risk and Special Education Services and Mary Ann Williams, Specialist, At Risk Services represented the SARS Section, while Larry Horyna, Director, USOE Project Assistant Services, provided facilitation and assistance. Both the Advisory Council and the SARS staff provided insight and assistance in the formulation of questions and development of the format. SARS secretaries Chris Angelos and Sabrina Sipes worked long hours editing, entering data, and finalizing reports.

On-site visits to the 40 districts were conducted with Mary Ann Williams acting as discussion guide and recorder. At Risk Consortium Leadership Team representatives Tom Hudson, Karen Kowalski, and Betty Brand rotated the on-site-team leadership responsibilities throughout the districts. SARS staff members, Cheryl Hostetter, Steve Kukic, and Mae Taylor provided additional insight during district visits as did Daryl Barrett, Chair of the Advisory Council. A special thanks goes to all district staff and other agency staff for their openness and graciousness during the 23 days of our visits.

The following report is divided into three sections: **Part One**--Report of On-Site Visits: Utah School District Services for Students At Risk; **Part Two**--Report of On-Site Visits: Interagency Collaborative Services for Students At Risk; and **Part Three**--An Agenda for Problem
Solving.

Part One--Report of On-Site Visits: School District Services for Students At Risk

During the on-site visits to the 40 school districts, data from district responses were collected. Discussion questions which centered around the topics noted below were used as guides for each visit. Each district identified staff participants to be involved. Thirty district superintendents or assistant superintendents were involved in the visits. In some instances, the superintendent also served as the district at risk director. Each discussion with district staff was approximately one-hour in duration. Individual district data have been compiled and summarized to provide this report.

• DISTRICT DEFINITIONS OF A "STUDENT AT RISK"

All district responses indicated elements of achievement and attendance and most indicated behavior as well in their definitions. In general, districts reported that they perceived "at risk" students as those who are experiencing difficulty in school either academically and/or socially. Descriptors included the following: poor achievers, non-attenders, poor social skills, behavior problems, not likely to complete school. Overall, district responses indicated an overall definition closely approximating that set forth in the Master Plan for Services for Students At Risk From Prevention Through Remediation; USOE; August 19, 1988. This definition follows:

> *A student at risk is any student who, because of his/her individual needs, requires some kind of uniquely designed intervention in order to achieve literacy, graduate, and be prepared for transition from school to post-school options. Without appropriate intervention, a student is at increased risk for failing to achieve commensurate with his/her ability, for truancy, and for dropping out. Without appropriate intervention, such a student may not be able to participate meaningfully in society as a competent, productive, caring, and responsible citizen.*

• DISTRICT ESTIMATED PERCENTAGES OF "STUDENTS AT RISK"

Each district estimated the percentage of their school-age population they considered to be at risk. The following were reflected in these responses:

Estimate Range:	10%-100%
Most Frequently Indicated Range:	35-55% (19 of the 40 districts indicated estimates in this broad range)

According to district estimates, 46.9% of Utah students are at risk. This 46.9 figure represents Utah's statewide weighted proportion of students at risk by district. For reporting purposes, this figure will be rounded to 47%.

This 47% estimate appears to be in harmony with statistical reports from Utah State Office of Education sources as well as other Utah agencies. The Utah State Office of Education reported the following statistics for the 1990-91 school year:

444,732	Utah children were enrolled in school: Kindergarten through 12th Grade
23,715	graduated from high school
10.21%	were dropouts
23,404	(5%) were Bilingual
46,602	(11%) received Special Education services
78,958	(18%) were identified as low income students
79,120	(18%) received "free lunch"
40,392	(9%) received reduced price lunch
851	(.02%) participated in MESA (Math, Engineering, Science Achievement) Programs targeted for under represented black, Hispanic, Indian, Polynesian, and female students
30,515	(6.8%) participated in Chapter 1 supplementary instructional programs in 275 schools across Utah's 40 districts: 16,885 males and 13,628 females and including 1,868 American Indians, 1005 Asians and Pacific Islanders, 498 blacks, 1360 Hispanics and 23,882 whites
1,600	(0.3%) age 3-21 participated in Migrant Education Programs
18	Alternative High Schools provided programs and services comprising 34% of Utah's Senior High Schools (Grades 10-12)

Utah Children, a statewide, non-profit child advocacy organization, in its publication: 1992 Key Facts About Children in Utah: Children and Families at Risk: A Status Report of Our Children, indicated, the following about Utah children and youth:

627,444	of Utah's population were under 18 years of age (1991)
171,800	6-11 year olds were estimated to need child care (39%) of the school-age population (1991)
116,800	aged 6 and under were estimated to need child care (1991)
3,718	babies were born to Utah teen mothers 19 years and younger (3% of the female population enrolled in Utah's schools) (1990)
41	babies were born to teen mothers under 15 years of age
1,145	babies were born to teen mothers in the 15-17 age range
15,000	under age 18 were estimated to be abusing alcohol or drugs: (3% of the school-aged population) (1991)
75,504	were estimated to live in poverty--families who meet the poverty level criteria
51,000	12 years and younger were believed to be hungry (1991)
4,284	were homeless (1990)
250	were served by Youth Corrections (1990)
95	were served by Youth Services (1990)
230	received Migrant Health Services (1990)
10,179	(1.6%) were in Foster Care (1991)
140	were victims of Educational Neglect (1991)
4,251	(0.67%) were in Foster Care (1991)
1,827	were provided shelter as a result of domestic violence (1991)

11,624	were estimated to have been involved in a family undergoing divorce, dissolution, and/or annulment (1991)
385	under the age of 19 years wee diagnosed with sexually transmitted diseases (1991)
4,321	were inadequately immunized in 1991
101,421	were eligible for CHEC/Medicaid Dental Services, 33,452 received at least one service (1991)
100,000	were estimated to be uninsured/not covered by any health insurance (1991)
56,470	were estimated to be at medical or psychosocial risk (1991)
11,288	were provided Community Mental Health Center services (1991)
32,000	were estimated as seriously emotionally disorder (1992)
1,632	Private Mental Health Centers and Hospitals provided treatment to Utah children and youth (1991)
109	were served at the State Hospital (1991)
2,442	were treated by the Division of Substance Abuse Alcohol and Drug Treatment Services (1991)
7,550	were admitted to Detention Centers (1991)
40,302	were referred to Juvenile Court (1991)
33%	of Utah youth aged 18 years in 1991 had at least one criminal referral to Juvenile Court during their teen years
1,321	were identified as gang members or associated (1992)

DISTRICT INDICATED AGE/GRADE LEVELS OF NEED

Most districts indicated that the percentage estimates were uniformly distributed across ages and grade levels. However, the middle school/junior high school grade levels were most frequently indicated as having the least services, program options, and in need of additional services. This age group was also most frequently noted as a recipient of programs and services funded with "at risk" flow-through funds.

Conditions Which May Contribute To a Student Being At Risk MASTER PLAN FOR SERVICES FOR STUDENTS AT RISK FROM PREVENTION THROUGH REMEDIATION ; AUGUST 19, 1988

The following conditions were recorded in the publication noted above. These conditions, along with others suggested as an update by the Leadership Team of the At Risk Consortium and the Executive Committee of the Utah State Board of Education Services for Students At Risk Advisory Committee, comprised the listing discussed during each on site visit.

A. *FAMILY RELATED*

DIVORCE/SEPARATION
CHILD OF AN ALCOHOL OR OTHER DRUG ABUSER
SINGLE PARENT FAMILY
TEENAGE PARENT

DEATH IN FAMILY
DYSFUNCTIONAL FAMILY MANAGEMENT
FAMILY ILLITERACY
MOBILITY
PHYSICAL/SEXUAL/PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE

B. SOCIO-ECONOMIC

CULTURAL DIFFERENCE
ETHNIC DIFFERENCE
RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCE
RACIAL DIFFERENCE
GENDER DIFFERENCE
POVERTY
GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION
MIGRANCY

C. INTRINSIC TO THE STUDENT

CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM AND TRUANCY
CHRONIC BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS
CHRONIC HEALTH PROBLEMS
CHRONIC UNDERACHIEVEMENT
INVOLVEMENT WITH THE COURT SYSTEM
GIFTEDNESS/CREATIVITY
HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS
LACK OF SOCIAL COMPETENCE AND INTERACTION SKILLS
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
LOW SELF ESTEEM
SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL IMMATURITY
SUICIDE-PRONE
TEEN PREGNANCY
SUBSTANCE ABUSE

- **Conditions Which May Contribute To a Student Being At Risk: Reports of Utah School Districts During On-Site Visits, 1992**

Districts reported the following listing of conditions they noted as present in their school-aged children and youth. This listing is not in a particular order of significance. It is also important to note that some of the conditions raised objections by staff from districts and other agencies. The condition of "single parent family," for example, raised objections as it was felt that condition may well represent a stable, functional family situation for a student. "Dysfunctional Family," on the other hand, was felt to need explanation and be expanded to include both traditionally viewed family configurations as well as non-traditionally constructed families.

A. *FAMILY RELATED*

DIVORCE/SEPARATION
CHILD OF AN ALCOHOL OR OTHER DRUG ABUSER (active or recovering)
SINGLE PARENT FAMILY
TEENAGE PARENT
DEATH IN FAMILY
SUICIDE IN FAMILY
DYSFUNCTIONAL FAMILY MANAGEMENT
LACK OF OR LIMITED PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT WITH CHILDREN/SCHOOLS
LACK OF OR LIMITED PARENTAL SUPPORT OF SCHOOLS
PARENT PROTECTION OF STUDENT FROM EXPERIENCING CONSEQUENCES OF ACTIONS
LACK OF OR LIMITED PARENTING SKILLS
UNSUPERVISED HOURS/STUDENTS "ALONE"
GENERATIONAL LOW EXPECTATIONS
FAMILY ILLITERACY
LIMITED PARENTAL ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
HOME LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH
CHRONIC HEALTH PROBLEM IN FAMILY
PARENTAL OR SIGNIFICANT FAMILY MEMBER MENTAL ILLNESS
MOBILITY
PHYSICAL/SEXUAL/PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE
STUDENT SENT TO LIVE WITH RELATIVES
FAMILY VIOLENCE
HOMELESS TEENS
PARENT/STUDENT CONFLICT/GIVING UP ON KIDS
RUNAWAYS
CHILDREN PLACED IN HOSPITALS/TREATMENT CENTERS BY PARENTS
FOREIGN STUDENTS SENT TO COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL
FOSTER CARE
CUSTODIAL CARE
LATCH-KEY (CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS)
GRANDPARENTS RAISING GRANDCHILDREN
HOME-SCHOOLS
PARENT(S) WORK OUT OF TOWN
INADEQUATE CHILD CARE
OLDER CHILDREN TEND YOUNGER CHILDREN

B. *SOCIO-ECONOMIC*

CULTURAL DIFFERENCE
ETHNIC DIFFERENCE
RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCE
RACIAL DIFFERENCE
GENDER DIFFERENCE
POVERTY
GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION
- FLIGHT FROM OTHER STATES
- LOW COST HOUSING
- PROXIMITY TO SERVICES
- ISOLATION FROM SERVICES
- HIGH EXPECTATIONS FOR AREA/SERVICES/AMENITIES

ECONOMIC SITUATION/OUTLOOK FOR AREA REQUIRE YOUNG PEOPLE TO LEAVE
MIGRANCY
HOMELESS FAMILIES
FEE WAIVERS
WELFARE
DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES
TOURISM IMPACT

C. ***INTRINSIC TO THE STUDENT***

CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM AND TRUANCY
CHRONIC BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS
CHRONIC HEALTH PROBLEMS
AIDS/HIV POSITIVE
CHRONIC DENTAL PROBLEMS
EATING DISORDERS
FETAL ALCOHOL/ADDICTION SYNDROME
DROP-OUT (HAVE DROPPED OUT)
POTENTIAL DROP-OUT
CHRONIC UNDERACHIEVEMENT
INVOLVEMENT WITH THE COURT SYSTEM
INVOLVEMENT WITH GANGS AND GANG ACTIVITY
GIFTEDNESS/CREATIVITY
HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS (DISABILITIES)
LACK OF SOCIAL COMPETENCE AND INTERACTION SKILLS
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
LOW SELF ESTEEM
SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL IMMATURITY
SUICIDE-PRONE
TEEN PREGNANCY
SUBSTANCE ABUSE
SEXUALLY ACTIVE
SATANISM
VIOLENT BEHAVIOR
WEAPONS IN SCHOOLS
DISCREPANCY IN READINESS AT PRESCHOOL/KINDERGARTEN ENTRY
INADEQUATE CHILD CARE
LACK OF RESPECT FOR OTHERS/AUTHORITY FIGURES
LIMITED NATIVE LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY
ADHD
SEX OFFENDERS
SEVERE BEHAVIOR (ACTING OUT)
LACK OF GOALS OR UNREALISTIC GOALS
LEARNED HELPLESSNESS
ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR
GENDER DISORDERS
HOMOSEXUALITY
EXCLUSION OF CHILDREN BY OTHERS
LACK OF BONDING
REPUTATION
WORKING STUDENTS
'DRIVE-IN' TO OTHER DISTRICT FOR SCHOOL

- **Conditions Reported As Present in District School-Age Populations: Results of Utah School Districts On-Site Visits; 1992 (Reported by Area, Condition, and Number of Districts Indicating Presence)**

Districts indicated the following conditions as being present in their school-age populations. The listing below is by frequency of report. It must be noted that some conditions appear to be noted infrequently. However, many of these were additions of individual districts. Had they appeared on the printed listing presented to each individual involved in the discussion during the on-site visit, the frequency of report may have differed.

Number of Districts Reporting	FAMILY RELATED
40	DIVORCE/SEPARATION
39	CHILD OF AN ALCOHOL OR OTHER DRUG ABUSER (active or recovering)
39	SINGLE PARENT FAMILY
37	TEENAGE PARENT
37	DEATH IN FAMILY
2	SUICIDE IN FAMILY
39	DYSFUNCTIONAL FAMILY MANAGEMENT
27	LACK OF OR LIMITED PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT WITH CHILDREN/SCHOOLS
16	LACK OF OR LIMITED PARENTAL SUPPORT OF SCHOOLS
25	PARENT PROTECTION OF STUDENT FROM EXPERIENCING CONSEQUENCES OF ACTIONS
15	LACK OF OR LIMITED PARENTING SKILLS
12	UNSUPERVISED HOURS/STUDENTS "ALONE"
13	GENERATIONAL LOW EXPECTATIONS
36	FAMILY ILLITERACY
37	LIMITED PARENTAL ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
36	HOME LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH
2	CHRONIC HEALTH PROBLEM IN FAMILY
2	PARENTAL OR SIGNIFICANT FAMILY MEMBER MENTAL ILLNESS
39	MOBILITY
39	PHYSICAL/SEXUAL/PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE
37	STUDENT SENT TO LIVE WITH RELATIVES
3	FAMILY VIOLENCE
36	HOMELESS TEENS
3	PARENT/STUDENT CONFLICT/GIVING UP ON KIDS
28	RUNAWAYS/RUN-TO'S
9	CHILDREN PLACED IN HOSPITALS/TREATMENT CENTERS BY PARENTS
5	FOREIGN STUDENTS SENT TO COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL
35	FOSTER CARE
34	CUSTODIAL CARE
39	LATCH-KEY (CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS)
9	GRANDPARENTS RAISING GRANDCHILDREN
15	HOME-SCHOOLS
10	PARENT(S) WORK OUT OF TOWN

1	INADEQUATE CHILD CARE
1	OLDER CHILDREN TEND YOUNGER CHILDREN

Number of Districts Reporting	SOCIO-ECONOMIC
36	CULTURAL DIFFERENCE
32	ETHNIC DIFFERENCE
35	RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCE
32	RACIAL DIFFERENCE
30	GENDER DIFFERENCE
38	POVERTY
35	GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION FLIGHT FROM OTHER STATES LOW COST HOUSING PROXIMITY TO SERVICES ISOLATION FROM SERVICES HIGH EXPECTATIONS FOR AREA/SERVICES/AMENITIES ECONOMIC SITUATION/OUTLOOK FOR AREA REQUIRE YOUNG PEOPLE TO LEAVE
32	MIGRANCY
28	HOMELESS FAMILIES
7	FEE WAIVERS
3	WELFARE
13	DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES
4	TOURISM IMPACT
1	INCARCERATED YOUTH GROUP HOMES

Number of Districts Reporting	INTRINSIC TO THE STUDENT
35	CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM AND TRUANCY
39	CHRONIC BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS
33	CHRONIC HEALTH PROBLEMS
31	CHRONIC DENTAL PROBLEMS
33	EATING DISORDERS
31	FETAL ALCOHOL/ADDICTION SYNDROME
34	DROP-OUT (HAVE DROPPED OUT)
36	POTENTIAL DROP-OUT
37	CHRONIC UNDERACHIEVEMENT
37	INVOLVEMENT WITH THE COURT SYSTEM
31	INVOLVEMENT WITH GANGS AND GANG ACTIVITY
31	GIFTEDNESS/CREATIVITY
35	HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS (DISABILITIES)
31	LACK OF SOCIAL COMPETENCE AND INTERACTION SKILLS
27	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
36	LOW SELF ESTEEM
33	SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL IMMATURITY
30	SUICIDE-PRONE

40	TEEN PREGNANCY
37	SUBSTANCE ABUSE
35	SEXUALLY ACTIVE
6	SATANISM
10	VIOLENT BEHAVIOR
4	WEAPONS IN SCHOOLS
19	DISCREPANCY IN READINESS AT PRESCHOOL/KINDERGARTEN ENTRY
1	INADEQUATE CHILD CARE
5	LACK OF RESPECT FOR OTHERS/AUTHORITY FIGURES
26	LIMITED NATIVE LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY
27	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
3	AIDS/HIV
3	ATTENTION DEFECIT DISORDER (ADD)
1	SEX OFFENDERS
1	SEVERE BEHAVIOR (ACTING OUT)
14	LACK OF GOALS OR UNREALISTIC GOALS
7	LEARNED HELPLESSNESS
2	ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR
2	GENDER DISORDERS
1	HOMOSEXUALITY
1	EXCLUSION OF CHILDREN BY OTHERS
1	LACK OF BONDING
1	REPUTATION BECOMES THE 'LAW'
1	WORKING STUDENTS
1	'DRIVE-IN' TO OTHER DISTRICT FOR SCHOOL

- **Conditions Indicated as "Great Concern" By Districts for Their School-Age Populations: Reported by Highest to Lowest Frequency**

Staff reported the following conditions as causing a higher level of concern to them than some others on the list. This does not infer, however, that the others are not of important significance to district and agency staff.

Number of Districts Reporting	CONDITION
22	DYSFUNCTIONAL FAMILY MANAGEMENT
(4)	LACK OF OR LIMITED PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT WITH CHILDREN/SCHOOLS
(4)	LACK OF OR LIMITED PARENTAL SUPPORT OF SCHOOLS
(4)	PARENT PROTECTION OF STUDENT FROM EXPERIENCING CONSEQUENCES OF ACTIONS
(4)	LACK OF OR LIMITED PARENTING SKILLS
(12)	UNSUPERVISED HOURS/STUDENTS "ALONE"
18	POVERTY
16	CHRONIC BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS
16	TEEN PREGNANCY
15	CHRONIC UNDERACHIEVEMENT
11	SUBSTANCE ABUSE

10	MOBILITY
10	STUDENTS SENT TO LIVE WITH RELATIVES
9	PHYSICAL/SEXUAL/PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE
9	CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM AND TRUANCY
9	SEXUALLY ACTIVE
8	GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION
	FLIGHT FROM OTHER STATES
	LOW COST HOUSING
	PROXIMITY TO SERVICES
	ISOLATION FROM SERVICES
	HIGH EXPECTATIONS FOR AREA/SERVICES/AMENITIES
	ECONOMIC SITUATION/OUTLOOK FOR AREA REQUIRE YOUNG PEOPLE TO LEAVE
7	LATCH-KEY CHILDREN/ADOLESCENTS
7	LOW SELF-ESTEEM
7	DISCREPANCY IN READINESS AT PRESCHOOL/KINDERGARTEN ENTRY
6	DIVORCE/SEPARATION
6	CHILD OF AN ALCOHOL OR OTHER DRUG ABUSER (active or recovering)
5	VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS
5	HOME SCHOOLS
5	HOMELESS TEENS
5	CHRONIC HEALTH PROBLEMS
5	DENTAL PROBLEMS
5	POTENTIAL DROP-OUT
4	UNSUPERVISED HOURS
4	MENTAL ILLNESS
4	FAMILY ILLITERACY
4	LIMITED PARENTAL ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
4	HOME LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH
4	LACK OF SOCIAL COMPETENCY/INTERACTION SKILLS
4	SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL IMMATURITY
3	CULTURALLY DIFFERENT
3	MIGRANCY
3	HOMELESS FAMILIES
3	DROP-OUT (HAVE DROPPED OUT)
3	SINGLE PARENT FAMILY
3	DISABILITIES
3	FEE WAIVERS
3	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
3	EDUCATOR DENIAL AND LACK OF SUPPORT
3	PARENTS GIVING UP ON KIDS/PARENT/CHILD CONFLICT
2	ETHNICALLY DIFFERENT
2	RELIGIOUSLY DIFFERENT
2	RACIALLY DIVERSE
2	GENDER DIFFERENCE
2	RUNAWAYS/RUN-TO'S
2	GIFTEDNESS/CREATIVITY
2	LIMITED NATIVE LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY
2	LACK OF GOALS/UNREALISTIC GOALS
2	PARENTAL HOSPITALIZATION OF CHILDREN/ADOLESCENTS FOR OUT-OF CONTROL BEHAVIOR
1	INVOLVEMENT WITH THE COURT SYSTEM

1	FOSTER CARE
1	GENERATIONAL LOW EXPECTATIONS
1	SUICIDE-PRONE
1	GRANDPARENTS RAISING GRANDCHILDREN
1	FOREIGN STUDENTS
1	INADEQUATE CHILD CARE
1	ADD
1	WELFARE
1	SEX OFFENDERS
1	SATANISM
1	SEVERE BEHAVIOR/ACTING OUT
1	INVOLVEMENT WITH GANGS AND GANG ACTIVITY
1	REPUTATION BECOMES THE LAW
1	STUDENTS WORKING
1	STUDENTS DRIVE-IN TO SCHOOL IN ANOTHER DISTRICT
1	OLDER CHILDREN STAY AT HOME TO TEND YOUNGER CHILDREN
1	INCARCERATED YOUTH GROUP HOMES

• DISTRICT INDICATED SOURCES FOR REFERRAL FOR "STUDENTS AT RISK"

All districts indicated utilization of the following as sources for referral:

Formal Standardized Tests	Classroom Performance
Academic Achievement	Informal/CBA Tests
Behavior/Social Skills	Grades
Attendance Reports/Records	Teacher Referral
School Reports	Parental Referral
Other Agency	Principal Referral

Some districts relied more heavily on certain sources than on others but all indicated openess to referrals from a variety of sources.

• DISTRICT SELF-REPORT OF PROGRAMS THAT WORK

Utah school districts have a wide variety of programs that are working for students at risk. Each district identified an average of 14 specific programs that are working. These are funded from a wide variety of sources. They also reflect participation of a cross-section of staff as well as community members. The following is a report of programs by district.

Name of District	Name of Program
Alpine	Next Step
	Young Parents High School
	Parent/Teen
	Life Skills Class
	Intervention Classes at H.S. with Students
	Junior High School Quest (mandated for all 7th Graders)
	Inservice
	Child Abuse
	Sex Harassment
	Summit Program
	Parkview Program
	Youth In Custody
	Mental Health Program
Beaver	Special Education
	PreSchool
	Chapter 1
	Positive Action Program HS and Elementary
	Family Involvement
	D.A.R.E.
	Principal Involvement
	Drug and Alcohol Program
	K-12 Curriculum
	Training Workshops
	Transition Partners
Box Elder	Young Mothers Program
	Options Program Support Group for Pregnant Teens
	Junior High Choices, Extension
	7th Grade Health Program
	Division Program Probation
	S.T.O. D.'s
	Alternative Schools
	VIP
	Inventive Program
	Migrant Program
	ART Program
Cache	Alternative Education Opportunity in Conjunction with Bridgerland ATC
	Young Men
	Alternative High School
	Counselor Run Groups
	Migrant Program
	Chapter 1
	Special Education

	Pre-School
	ODDM-(Elementary)
	Primary School(K-2)
	Focus on 2nd Grade (benchmark for reading at grade level)
Carbon	Mental Health Services in Schools
	Head Start
	Pre-1st Grade
	Pre-2nd Grade
	Free Lunch & Breakfast
	Pro-Care
	Certification Program
	Extension EnrollmentsThrough CORE
	Mild/Severe Special Education Program
	University of Phoenix Counseling Program
	Chapter I
	Special Education
Daggett	Use of Natural Area as Classroom
	Activities
	Special Education
	8th Period Extension
	CORE Curriculum
	TARGET Teaching
	Mastery Monitoring
	District OBE
	Updated Technology (every classroom is networked)
	Write-to-Write, Read-to-Write, Write-to-Read
Davis	Parent Cooperative PreSchool
	Special Education PreSchool
	Early Intervention
	Head Start
	Young Parents
	Alternative High School
	Student Intervention Program (SIP)
	Self-Esteem Programs
	Boys Town Social Skills Training
	Teen Line
	IBRIC (7th Grade Transition)
	Special Education
	Chapter I
	Indian Education Program
	Secondary Skills Project
Duchesne	DARE
	Teen Parents
	Adult Education (Thompson School)

	Chapter I
	Special Education
	OBE
	Tailor Made Programs
	Citizenship Coursework
	Activities Menu
	Comprehensive School Offerings
	BD Unit
	After School Tutoring
Emery	SEOP CASP Team
	K-6th Grade
	Guidance Counselor
	Chapter 1
	Special Education
	Breakfast and Lunch Programs
	PreSchool
	Pre-1st Grade Program
	OBE
	School-Based Mental Health Services
	Peer-Helper Program
Garfield	One On One Tutoring
	Peer Tutoring/Teaching
	Student Bonding
	Teacher Assistants
	PreSchool Efforts
	Direct Instruction in Elementary Schools
	Substance Abuse Awareness Program
	Inter-Agency Council
Grand	Middle school
	After-School Programs
	Nuturing The Family
	Parent Academy
	PreSchool Program
	Special Education
	Outdoor Environmental Center
	Comprehensive High School
	Parent Central High School
	Drug Free (DARE)
	Chemical Dependancy Program
	Parent Advisory Board
	CASP
	Chapter 1
	Special Education

Granite	Drug and Alcohol Program
	Junior and Senior High Programs
	Training Program
	Peer Leadership
	Teen Parent
	Program at Central H.S.(Community Education)
	Parent Education
	Safe Schools Policy
	Hospital Programs
	MESA
	Cultural Advisors
	ESL
	Math Tutors K-12
Iron	Early Intervention
	Interagency Council
	Special Education/Pre-School
	Youth-In-Custody Program
	Direct Instruction
	Teacher Training
	Self-Esteem
	Positives
Jordan	Drug and Alcohol "Prevention Dimensions"
	Parent Education Nights
	Aftercare
	Crisis Team
	Riskline
	Grief and Loss Training
	Pride
	Puppet Power
	High Risk Counseling
	Suicide Prevention
	Children of Alcoholics and Adult Children of Alcoholics
	Peer Leadership Teams
	Discipline School
	Pre-Referral Interventions
	Special Needs Services
	Early Intervention Class
	Early "At Risk" Intervention Program
	Student/Family Success Program
	Youth Special Programs
	Isolation of Minorities
	Midvale Elementary
	Bilingual At-Risk Program
	Migrant Program
	Indian Program

	MESA Program
	Gang Prevention and Intervention
	Latch Key Schools
	Gifted and Talented
	Accelerated Learning Program (ALP's)
	Secondary Gifted and Talented Education
	Parent Partners
	Inservice Classes Open to Parents
	Programs Tailor-Made For the Gifted
Juab	High School Teacher Assist (OT/PT)
	Speech Services
	Chapter 1 After School Before School
	CBE
	Mastery Learning
	Preteach in Regular School(give snacks 2 or 3 days per week)
	Middle School Program
	Talent-up
	Full Inclusion
	Upward Bound
	JTPA
	PreSchool
	Pre-School for At Risk Kids
	Interagency Council
	Chapter 1
	SUU
	Department-Wide Inservice Training
	U. of U. Rural M.S. Program
	Breakfast, Lunch Program
	Snacks In School
Kane	Special Education
	Transition
	Badges at Elementary School
	Special Education (Full Inclusion)
	Activities In High School
	Job Service Transition (GIS)
	Talent Search From Dixie College Counseling
	School Climate (emphasis on caring about kids)
	Support for Pregnant Teens
	Opening (find something good about a kid and call home)
	Principal Eats Lunch With Kids
	ODDM
	Safe School
	Preschool
Logan	Youth-In-Custody Program
	PreSchool (language)

	After-School Program (2-5)
	Pamphlet For New Parents Distributed In Hospital
	Cross-Age Tutoring
	Social Skills
	Classwide Tutoring
	Mentor Tracking
	Work With USU
	Use USU Students To Tutor--"Big Buddy"
	Parent Training
	Young Mothers Program
	South Campus Program (Alternative High School)
	Direct Instruction
	Well-Defined-Well-Suited Curriculum
Millard	PreSchool
	Parent Involvement Program
	Alternative Learning Center
	Special Education
	Chapter 1
	Parenting Class
	ODDM
	Reality Therapy
	Alcohol and Drug Prevention Program
	Mental Health Support/Counselors
Morgan	Alternative School Program
	PM School
	Graduation Alert
	Preschool Special Education Plus Head Start
	PTA Programs
	Law Enforcement Programs
	Chapter 1
	Special Education
	Cooperative Learning
	Instructional Program Effort In Middle School
	Teachers Earn Own Computers
	ODDM
	Active Athletics and Other Activities (Speech, Academic Decathalon, Math)
	Small Classes
Murray	Young Mothers Program
	Elementary School Counseling
	Chapter 1
	PreSchool
	Special Education
	Drug and Alcohol Prevention Program
	Peer Leadership
	Alternative High School

	Early Childhood Program
	Educational Center (Head Start)
	Parenting Classes
	Displaced Homemakers Program
	Cooperative Learning
Nebo	County Health
	Smokeless Tobacco
	Alternative High School
	Teen Pregnancy Program
	High School Young Parent (coordination work with adult H.S. to stay in school)
	Job Training Guidance
	Vocational Programs
	Technical Skills Training
	Baby Your Baby
	Adult Education
	CORE Plan
	BYU Partners (Jr. High-7th grade high risk, counselor follows rest of school years)
	Self-Esteem Program
	After-School 7th Grade Program
	Study Skills Program
	Support-A-Student Program (teachers select a student and buddy)
	EEI (Madeline Hunter Training for Teachers)
North Sanpete	Special Education
	Chapter 1
	Migrant Program
	TIC Tracking
	JTPA
	Control Theory/Realty Therapy Training Program
	At Risk First Grade
	Middle School Planning
North Summit	PreSchool
	Chapter 1
	Drug and Alcohol Prevention Program
	Secondary Counseling
	Special Education
Ogden	Young Mothers Program
	K-3 Interagency Program
	Special Education
	Chapter 1
	Migrant Program
	Project "Cares"
	Delinquency Prevention

	Behavioral Disorder Units with Day Treatment (cooperative interagency effort)
	PreSchool/Adult Literacy
	Washington Alternative High School
	Parenting Connection
	Collaboration Efforts and Councils
	ESL
	Multi-Cultural Center
	Ethnic Minority Programs
Park City	Child Study Team
	Teaching Assistant Team
	Elementary Counseling
	SWAT (secondary schools)
	Valley Mental Health Programs
	Substance Abuse Program
	Red Ribbon Week
	Life Skills--5th grade
	Chapter 1
	Integrated PreSchool
	Peer Support H.S./Middle School
	Norwegian School of Nature
	ROPES (teaming building before school)
	Special Education
	National Helpers
	Community of Caring
Piute	Teen Council
	Leadership Development Council
	4-H Club
	Extension (USU)(ages 12-19)
	Pre-Teen Council (ages 12-13)
	Drug-Free Counseling
	Talent Search
	Chapter 1
	Assertive Discipline
	Active Sport Program
	Special Education
	After Hour Make-Up Class
Provo	Involvement of Parents
	Participating Partners
	Breakfast Program
	Park View Center
	Young Mothers Program
	Substance Abuse Prevention Program
	Language Rich PreSchool
	Attendance Officer

	Latch Key Program
	Parent-Teen
	Alternative High School
	Special Education
	Chapter 1
	LAP
	Inservice Training
	High School Working With Middle School
	PHASE
	Curriculum Development
	Integration Program
	Parent Volunteers
	Teacher Leadership
	Young Entrepreneurs
	SEOP's
	SEP Visits
	Team Teaching
Rich	Alternative Program
	Weber ATC
	After-School Tutoring Services
	Counselor (weekly basis)
	Activities
	Assemblies
	Drug and Alcohol Program
	Inservice Training
	Incentive Program
	Tutoring
	HOTS
	Special Education
	Computer Technology
	Student Teachers
	Chapter 1
Salt Lake	Reading Recovery
	HOPE (6 elementary schools)
	Health Program
	Social Services Involvement
	Salt Lake Community High School Programs
	HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skills)
	Pre-Kindergarten Program (All Chapter 1 Schools)
	Satellite Head Start Programs
	Drug and Alcohol Prevention Program
	Special Education
	Mental Health Programs
	Gifted Program through High School
	Even Start
	At Risk High School Direction Program

	Elementary Counseling
	On-Going Curriculum Development
	Literary Language Arts Reading
	Math
	Social Studies
	Performance Standards and Benchmark
	Parent Classes
	Parent/Child Night
San Juan	Even Start
	Head Start
	PreSchool
	9-District Consortium
	Summer Programs
	Home Visits and Counseling
	San Juan Courts Volunteer From VISTA
	School on Reservation
	Parent Involvement
	Cultural Awareness
	CEU Partnerships
	Volunteer Workers
	Peer Tutoring
	5 Weeks Extra Training Time for Staff
	ODDM
	Peer Coaches
Sevier	Direct Instruction
	Benchmark Tests-District Made
	Learning Coordinator
	Teaching Assistant In Lower Grades
	University Certification Program
	Special Education
	Chapter 1
	Pre-School
	Reduced Pupil/Teacher Ratio In Early Grades
	District Curriculum Alignment: K-12
South Sanpete	Snow College Counseling At Middle School For At Risk
	Middle School At Risk Program
	Psychologist Program
	Pre-School
	Chapter 1
	Special Education
	Athletics
South Summit	New Kids-(Friendshipping)
	Added Period A Day (How to study)
	Journal

	Setting Goals Program
	Lots of School Related Activities
	Glasser Model In Schools
	DARE
	CBE
	Corrective Extension
	Late Bus (kids can stay and work)
	Chapter 1
	Russian Course
	Norwegian School of Nature
Tintic	Glasser Model in Schools
	Control Theory
	Transition Programs
	PreSchool
	Small Class Size
	Reading Program (one hour per week for everyone to read material of choice)
	High School Librarian Reads to Pre-Schoolers and Kindergarteners
	Computer Usage
	Adult/Child Conflict Program
	Wide Variety of Activities
	Community Youth Center
	Independent Study at UVCC
	Cross/School Teachers
	Minority Program
Tooele	Early Intervention Interagency Program (Grantsville Elementary)
	Head Start Expansion
	Pre-Kindergarten Screening
	After-School Activities
	After-School Tutoring
	Alternative School
	Breakfast Program
	DARE (6th Graders)
	ESL
	Esteem Teams
	Extended Day Program
	Head Start
	In-School Suspension
	Parent Volunteers
	Peer Counseling
	Positive Action
	Pre-School
	Remedial Reading Program
	Sex Respect
	Summer School
	TODM

	Adolescent Services
	Young Mothers Program
	Staff Development (Superintendent Meets With Each Principal List of 20 Outcomes)
	"We" Focus (Entire School Involved)
Uintah	Broad Scope Of Activities To Keep Kids In School
	Computerized SEOP
	Interagency Collaboration
	Special Education
	Chapter I
	CORE Teams
	Assistance Program
	Teenage Preqnancy Prevention Program
Wasatch	Parent workshops
	CORE
	6-Pack Program
	6-Packs in High School
	Prevention Service and Counseling With Social Services
	Collaboration With Multiple Agencies
	Drug Prevention Program (involves local/county law enforcement)
	School Health Nurse (All work In School)
	Latch Key Services with Utah State Extension
	Alternative School
	Chapter 1
	Special Education
	Concurrent Enrollment
	Diverse Curriculum
	Strong Counseling Program
	Extra Curricular Activities
	Up-to-Date Tests
	Shared Counselor/Social Worker With Social Services
Washington	Special Education
	Adolescent Learning Center (ALC)
	Pre-School
	Upward Bound
	Talent Search
	Counseling Services For At-Risk Students
	Job Corps
	Job Placements For At Rick Students
	Vocational Technical Programs
	Chapter 1 Supplemental Reading Program
	Drug And Alcohol Program
	Elementary Counseling Program
	Youth In Custody
	At Risk Program

	Millcreek High School Program
	Young Parents Program
	Interagency Council
	Instructional Clinics
	JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act)
	Teacher Assistance Team (TAT)
	Interagency Case Management Team (ICMT)
Wayne	Special Education
	Chapter I
	PreSchool (intergrated with Head Start)
	Drug and Alcohol Education Program
	Tabacco Education Program
	Sex Education
	Director of Instruction In All Schools and Programs
	Unified Curriculum and Programs
	School Programs for Middle High School
Weber	Self-Awareness Program
	Weber High School Pregnancy Support Groups
	Option K-12
	After Care Program
	Support Groups
	Teen Power
	Peer Leadership,
	Peer Helpers
	Partners for Success
	Interagency Collaboration
	Special Education
	PM School At T.H. Bell
	Staff Flexibility
	Dropout Prevention Program
	ATC
	Transition Program
	Child Abuse Counseling
	Joint Inservice Across Agencies
	Options Aide at Jr. High Schools

DISTRICT REPORTED COMPONENTS OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS

District staff interviews reflected a number of factors which contribute to the success of programs for students. The most frequently indicated factor was the quality of the staff. This was closely followed by two closely related factors: local level leadership and administrative support at the superintendent, district, and principal levels. Small class activities, training and inservice, and other agency and community involvement. Following is a complete listing of all district responses. The number in parentheses reflects the number of districts who indicated the factor.

- Quality of staff: "care and do, dedicated; make things happen; get out and do it;" supportive of students and schools; believe in students; "put kids first;" "sensitive to people" (26)
- Leadership at local level (22)
- Administrative support at the superintendent, district, and principal levels (21)
- Small class size: pupil/teacher ratio low enough so everyone can participate and teacher can make real contact with each student (9)
- Have a variety of programs and services (8)
- Small population: everyone has a chance to participate in district/school activities; everyone knows everyone; involvement (7)
- Training and inservice (7)
- Other agencies involved: we all work together (7)
- Community involvement: community cares and works together (6)
- Programs and services are focused on individual needs (6)
- School-based (5)
- Efforts and $ support programs and services (5)
- Common vision: vision of what ought to be (4)
- Positive emphasis and attitudes (4)
- Unified, consistent approach (3)
- Parental involvement/support (3)
- Curriculum: well-defined/well-suited, challenging (3)
- Open atmosphere (2)
- Strategic plan (2)
- Technology (2)
- Superintendent (2)

- School board and county recreation board are one and the same (1)
- Limited resources force folks to work together (1)
- Make resources available (1)
- Limited fees (1)
- Work as a group (1)
- Breakfast program: students not hungry (1)
- Inclusion/integration of all students (1)
- Mentoring system (1)
- Bilingual staff (1)
- Students bonded (1)
- Mental Health involved (1)
- Transition (1)
- Planning time (1)
- Venture High School (1)
- CBTU (1)
- High expectations (1)
- Whole lot of little things (1)
- DARES (1)
- Relationship with police officer (1)
- Data-based and researched: field-based decisions (1)
- Early intervention (1)
- Rural setting (1)
- Teachers can earn computers (1)
- Career Ladder Projects (1)

- USU (1)
- Concurrent enrollment (1)
- Home visits (1)
- Cross-age/grade level classes (1)
- Teachers teach across a variety of subjects/contents/grades (1)
- Take testing seriously (1)

DISTRICT REPORTS OF NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED

Each district indicated a variety of goals and activities they felt required attention and action. As each district has unique, specific student needs requiring attention, the responses appear more varied in this section than in some of the others. The responses below are listed in the order of frequency of district report indicated by the number in the parentheses.

- Need to be able to take more students into programs already in existence (7)
- Need to consolidate district level categorical programs and services under one umbrella--too fragmented (4)
- Need more classroom/content teachers who will work with at risk students (4)
- Need alternative high school programs (4)
- Need more support services (counseling, trackers, administrative assistance, etc.) (4)
- Need training for teachers and technical assistants to help students (behavior and and academic) (3)
- Need more parent education (2)
- Reduce class size (2)
- Need assistants for principals (2)
- Put more teacher assistants in early grades to cut class size (2)
- Reduce paperwork: small districts have to do the same as large districts; too much to do (2)
- Need more 6-packs (2)

- Need dependable partners to work with us at all levels (2)
- Need to get help to students who are not eligible for special education or chapter I (2)
- System needs to be redone to help kids--sometimes system is the problem (2)
- Special Education absorbing kids who shouldn't be classified (2)

The following were reported one time only:

- More teachers at junior high levels
- English As A Second Language (ESL)
- Discipline and behavior management
- Breakfast program
- Rapid learning center
- Youth center or activities for kids in the community
- Need to provide students at a young age with planning opportunities--daily plans
- After-school program for students
- Summer school
- Latch-key programs
- Expand MESA
- Begin at the preschool level
- Model program for residential hospital
- Inundated with court requests
- Programs for minority students at risk
- Pilot program for middle school
- More counselors at the high school
- Bring services to the classroom--not pull-out

- Help with home schools
- Find a way to address truancy
- Interagency collaborative council
- More district level help
- Individualized instruction
- More parental involvement
- State to consolidate services, meetings, programs, and rules

DISTRICT INDICATED BARRIERS TO ADDRESSING NEEDS

The district staff identified those factors which prevent them from implementing needed programs or undertaking specific action. The most frequently cited barrier was lack of money. Thirty-seven of the 40 districts reported lack of adequate fiscal resources as a major barrier. The next most frequently mentioned responses were trained staff and time. Lack of other agency involvement and need for more counselors were also indicated as barriers. Identified barriers are reported below by frequency of districts responses. The number of districts indicating each barrier is reflected in the parentheses.

- Money (lack of fiscal resources) (37)
- Trained staff (12)
- Time (12)
- Lack of other agency involvement (5)
- Lack of counselors (5)
- Lack of parental involvement (4)
- Inservice and resources to pay for it (3)
- State formulas for fund distribution (2)
- Certification (2)
- Activities association regional re-alignment (2)
- Categorical allocation of funds blocks local efforts (2)

- Requirements from categorical programs block efforts (2)
- Bureaucracy (2)
- Legal aspects (2)

Barriers indicated one time only:

- Legislative
- Denial on the part of parents and community
- District organization keeps services fragmented
- State organization keeps services fragmented
- Size of district (small)
- Low incidence
- Confidentiality and coordination between agencies
- Class size
- Too much to do
- Expectations exceed reality
- Teacher load
- Space
- Information
- Hospitals do not work with districts

DISTRICT REPORTS OF NEEDED USOE/CONSORTIUM ASSISTANCE

District responses indicated that the ten most frequently identified areas of needed assistance to districts included increasing fiscal resources; reducing paperwork; disseminating ideas and information about effective programs and services; making on-site visits to classrooms, programs, and districts to actually see what is occurring; keeping regulations to a minimum; staying in touch with and assisting individual districts with identified areas of concern; providing information about "state-of-the-art" programs, ideas, and services; continuing to work to get all agencies working together; combining state level services and rules; and conducting regional or topical

meetings. It appears that some responses appear closely related, and, in fact, may be elements of others. Reducing paperwork, keeping regulations down, and combining services and rules at the state level may each be dependent upon the other and would require simultaneous attention.

District reports, along with the number of responses for each item, are indicated below:

- Send money (25)
- Reduce paperwork (22)
- Share ideas and information about what works (programs, services, etc.) (22)
- Make on-site visits to classrooms--non-evaluative (19)
- Keep regulations down (18)
- Keep in touch and work with us (17)
- Keep us on the "cutting edge" (14)
- Keep working to get other agencies to work with us (13)
- Combine services and rules at the state level (12)
- Conduct regional meetings (11)
- Keep informed about educational neglect and truancy--keep social services involved (10)
- Bring meetings out to the regions (9)
- Look at regions differently--who meets with who (5)
- Look at funding formula for low incidence areas (5)
- Provide information on home schools (4)
- Share information on resources (4)
- Have informal at risk meetings (4)
- Cut down on numbers of meetings (4)
- Use EdNet for small group meetings and discussions (4)
- Keep us informed on new programs (4)

- Talk to PAR folks (3)
- Combine special education and Chapter I (3)
- Put together some kind of automated "what works" guide or system (3)
- Represent rural/small districts on certification issues (2)
- Provide videos/newsletter for at risk (2)

The following were noted by individual districts:

- Advocate for ATC in region
- Keep memos brief
- Need help with teen pregnancy programs
- Provide training during rural schools conference, elementary and secondary principals conferences, and Troubled Youth Conference
- Provide a formula so that support staff generate funds
- Help us write grants
- Help us with Special Education and Chapter I
- State agency practices exclusion

SAMPLES OF DISTRICT REPORTS OF AT RISK FUND UTILIZATION

Districts indicated a wide range of programs and activities which are supported by at risk flow through funds. Districts reported that many of the programs are funded from a variety of sources, at risk funds being one source. Small districts receiving the "base" amount: ($10,000) leverage these funds with others to provide as much assistance as they can to meet the increasing needs of students.

- Programs in junior and senior high schools
- Secondary school trackers
- Assist with funding for educational program for students with severe behavior/social skills problems
- Focus on early grades (K-2nd grade)
- High school compensatory services

- Conference on family values
- Part of a teacher at secondary school to provide tutoring assistance
- Individual school projects to meet identified needs
- Citizenship class after hours
- After-school assistance for middle school students
- Portion of teacher assistant for assistance at elementary and middle school
- Part of guidance counselor for elementary school
- Teacher Assistance Teams
- Tutors for middle/junior high school
- Discipline school
- Special needs program
- Helps fund teacher assistants to go into classrooms where identified students need assistance
- Teacher assistants for middle school students--counsel, tutor--after,before, and during school
- Prevention activities all grade levels
- Purchased computer software curriculum materials
- Part counselor time
- Additional teacher 2 periods per day to tutor/counsel
- Transitional support
- After-school study skills and counseling
- Teacher assistant: part-time first grade
- Combined with other funds to hire counselor assistant at middle school and high school--track, monitor, tutor...
- Combined with other funds for additional counselor time and services
- Inservice training for teachers

- Staff to run special programs for at-risk students
- Additional counseling and tutoring assistance

PART 2

Report of On-Site Visits: Interagency Collaborative Services for Students At Risk

The second portion of each on-site visit focused on interagency collaborative efforts. Representatives from community agencies and organizations participated in these discussions in 14 sites. In the remaining areas, district staff provided representation. General questions to facilitate discussion were distributed to each participant and responses were recorded. Discussion questions centered around the topics noted below. Data have been compiled and summarized to provide this report. Each discussion was approximately one-hour in duration.

• REPORTS OF INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

Interagency collaboration was reported in all 40 sites. Participation was reported as crucial in order to provide services and programs for students. The majority (29) reported that these interagency collaborative efforts were formalized. Most reported indicated that staff are involved in a number of interagency collaborative councils, committees, task forces, and teams across their communities. Representatives reported that in instances the same people represent the same agencies with the only change being the agenda and leadership. District staff reported high levels of involvement in intra-agency committees and task forces as well. General responses indicated that the frequency and length of meetings is dependent upon each group and the perceived need--most formally composed groups (29) indicated meeting on a regularly scheduled basis; however, some groups in smaller populated areas indicated that they currently meet only when someone has a problem.

• REPORTED ATTRIBUTES OF INTERAGENCY COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS

Interagency representatives provided information and insight as to those factors which contribute to effective collaboration across agencies and organizations. Most effective interagency collaborative councils reported spending the majority of their time (90%) in "case management" activities or discussing individual cases. However, at some level of interagency collaboration, issues of policy, programs, and services must be addressed according to feedback collected. Below are specific factors which participants reported.

- Work well together
- Share information--critical component

- Flexibility of members--bend some rules
- Trust those who attend to keep confidentiality and follow-through on what they commit to do
- Members can commit resources/services
- Focus on individual students/children/youth
- The more we know about what other agencies do/provide, the better we all understand, think, and work together for the child/youth
- Parent integral member of the team
- All agencies represented who need to be
- Not afraid to risk/try something new
- Helps us all do the job for kids by working together/mutually beneficial
- Meetings benefit kids
- Matter of survival
- Agree to not ever do something anyone else is doing
- Gives us control: know other people across agencies in the community
- Those who sit around the table are dedicated to kids and making things work
- Cooperation
- Common commitment
- Channel resources to get services for kids who need services we don't have
- Agencies call the "bluff" of others
- Representatives on the council are effective: know area, programs, regulations, funding, etc.
- All are professionals and act professionally and responsibly
- Can talk freely, share information
- Representatives and councils have support of agency administration
- Opportunity to network

BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

Representatives participating in the visit reported the following barriers. In the discussions, seventeen interagency groups reported that there were critical agencies and organizations not represented in their collaborative efforts. In addition, there were reports that some

representatives did not attend meetings regularly even though they were assigned. Individual districts and regions indicated specific instances.

- Everyone sits on too many interagency councils
- Not all agencies/organizations represented who need to be
- Some representatives attend sporadically
- Time--takes time for people to go to meeting and takes time for an interagency collaborative group to "come together"
- People--people who represent agencies must be able to work with others, commit resources, and follow-up
- Money--need more
- Lack of support from
  - Agency level administration
  - Individual agency(ies)
- Agency workload(s)--composition of funding and numbers and types of cases may limit numbers of hours available to work across agencies and organizations
- Confidentiality, turf, individual agency requirements
- Reverse turfism--agencies deny involvement
- Some agencies appear to be trying to back out of everything
- What state level folks say doesn't get followed through at the county level--"attitude of just wait and this will pass"
- Differences in philosophies across agencies and organizations
- People with "little vision" assigned to represent agency
- Staff to coordinate and bring group together
- So many agencies involved, may "overkill" with services...replicate services

REPORTED NEEDED ASSISTANCE FROM STATE LEVEL AGENCIES/ORGANIZATIONS

Staff representing districts and other agencies and organizations indicated that assistance is needed from state level agency leadership. Responses emphasized the need for a uniform message from all state level leadership to all local staff regarding the priority of interagency efforts and related information.

- More money
- Assist interagency councils in development, ongoing maintenance, and with specific problems at local level
- Review fund distribution formula--make sure each area has enough to do something
- Review regional staff assignments--make sure each area has service
- All agency services at the local level need to have clarification about interagency collaboration from state agencies--send the same message
- Training needed in a variety of topics, including interagency collaboration and related areas
- Keep councils and agencies informed
- Help with confidentiality issues
- Encourage all agencies to get representatives to the "table"
- Provide for more K-3 (school-based intervention) interagency programs
- Reinforce positive efforts across agencies--state/regional level staff need to recognize and appropriately acknowledge local staff efforts
- Pull definitions together across agencies--"common language"
- Look at low incidence in small, isolated communities--costs more to provide needed service and funding formula does not always take that into account, also do not always have appropriately trained servers or programs...
- Get information out to us about what is happening, what works...
- Focus on gaps in services on an individual council basis--conduct poll on individual council/community basis to determine what each needs, what" level" each is functioning...

- State agencies need to act as a resource--be sensitive to local needs
- Provide inservice and coursework across agencies
- Help with case management
- Need support groups for children/youth and parents

PART 3
An Agenda for Problem Solving

- **FUNDING**

More funding with combined resource utilization is needed to meet the needs of children and youth.

Inadequate funding appears to be the greatest barrier to providing services for students at risk throughout the state. Legislation at state and federal levels, compliance issues, state-level agency rules and regulations....also permeate and, in some instance restrict district and community efforts. Interagency representatives indicated needs for a wide variety of services and programs to meet the individual needs of children, youth, and families. Development and maintenance of such requires fiscal resources. School fee waivers for eligible students, for example, while providing access to activities for all students, further decreases the amount of money required support for the variety of programs and services offered through schools; thereby, reducing overall community offerings to children and youth. Concern was expressed throughout the state relative to the resolution of this dilemma to the benefit of all students and communities. Problem areas identified include:

- Providing additional funds for services and programs for students (children and youth) at risk

  In some areas, representatives indicated the need to extend already existing services to more children, youth, and their families. In other areas, services are not available and need to be developed or provided. This is especially evident in smaller, more isolated communities where services may be provided regionally, but distances and travel preclude access by those requiring them.

- Reducing and combining internal state-level funding restrictions, rules, and regulations within and across agencies so that school, district, and community agency and organizational staff can utilize available funds to provide services to identified children and youth with needs

  Representatives indicated that the categorical nature of funds within and across agencies makes meeting needs of students (children and youth) at risk difficult and restricts service availability. In addition, regulations

require staff to invest "a lot of time" completing categorically specific forms which appear to vary little one from another without regard to amount of money or size of community. Further, knowledge of specific categorical regulations is required from staff making decisions at a student (child or youth) level in order to determine if fiscal resources can, in fact, be utilized to provide a required services.

- Reviewing and modifying funding formulas with attention to small isolated areas with low incidence and high service costs as well as to heavily populated areas Responses obtained from representatives reaffirm the widely divergent community needs existing in Utah. It is evident that isolated and often small communities are faced with problems reflected in the more heavily populated areas. It is also apparent that the students (children and youth) exhibiting these conditions require services no matter where they live. Small, isolated communities report challenges in funding services needed for low incidence but critical needs of children and youth at risk. Regional availability is often not adequate as issues of distance, lack of transportation, time involved in travel, and separation from family and community pose insurmountable problems: jeopardizing efficacy and limiting access. Simultaneously, larger urban areas report being heavily impacted with numbers of students (children and youth) requiring services. While The provision of services for larger numbers may be cost effective, factors of increasing numbers, diversity, and severity must also be taken into account.

• PROMOTING INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

No single agency can provide for all needs of children and youth alone: Only by working together can the needs of children and youth be met.

Participants in the on-site visits reflected the need for all state level leaders of agencies and organizations involved in services to children, youth, and families to clearly and repeatedly convey their commitment to interagency collaboration as a high priority. Participants also indicated that this be carried to all levels throughout the system, and that efforts of local staff involved in collaborative efforts be recognized and fostered.

- Modeling effective intra-and interagency collaboration at state and district levels

Representatives indicated the need for agencies to look internally at organizational structures and activities as well as across agencies. Representatives indicated that all "players" need to be represented

within and across agencies and that organizational structure impedes or assists in this. Participants indicated the need for intra and inter agency collaboration problem solving around the following areas:

Confidentiality
Meeting Formats
Case Management
Identification of Effective Program, Interventions, and Service Models
Roles
Turf

- Assisting local development and maintenance of interagency collaborative teams and councils

  Participants indicated need for assistance specific to their unique team, council,community, school, district, etc. It is clear that each team and/or council is uniquely configured and structured to reflect local needs and resources and that each has evolved processes and procedures to work and solve problems together. Unified (cross discipline, categorical, agency) assistance needs to be responsive to site specific concerns as well as to general issues of role identification, turf, confidentiality, meeting formats, case management, state and federal legal issues and subsequent relevance to each site.

- Providing inservice and training across disciplines and agencies

  Repeatedly, representatives indicated the need to have a unified message and approach from state and regional leadership. In addition, the need for well-trained, competent staff was indicated consistently throughout the state. Participants indicated the need to have timely, relevant inservice provided which would cross categorical programs, agencies, and organizations. The emphasis was on the provision of inservice and training needed by individual locations to keep them informed as to the most current state and federal information, provide training in effective practices, disseminate validated program and strategy information, etc. in a unified and consistent approach from state and regional levels.

- Developing accounting and role description procedures which acknowledge and fund time required for intra-and interagency collaboration

  Time is a critical component in working across disciplines, agencies, and organizations. Representatives reflected the need for such commitment to be reflected in assignments and operating procedures. In some instances, funding mechanisms must be developed or modified to promote and maintain collaboration as well.

- **STREAMLINING**

Successful collaboration requires effective utilization of all resources: procedures, funding mechanisms, rules and regulations within and across agencies guide such utilization.

Representatives indicated the need to work together in order to meet the needs of Utah students (children and youth) at risk. In order to meet the severity and complexity of individual needs demonstrated by an ever increasing number of children and youth, it will require working across disciplines and agencies in a team approach with parents. Proposed legislation, rule-making, policy and procedure development will need to be reviewed relative to meeting the needs of students (children and youth) and their families at the point of service delivery. Questions regarding existing and proposed federal, state, and local laws, rules and regulations must address issues regarding the effectiveness and ease of service implementation to those in need.

- Extending effective, already existing services and programs to additional students (children and youth) and families

  Effective services, programs, and delivery systems are in place throughout Utah. Reports, indicate, however, that these need to be extended to more children, youth, and their families who need them. In some instances services need to be brought closer, geographically, to those in need in order to provide access. In other instances, funding will not allow expansion or development.

- Establishing communication linkages within and across agencies for service and program level networking and information dissemination

  Information is critical in meeting needs of students (children and youth) and families. How information is disseminated and shared among and between those involved directly impacts services. Representatives identified a need to have access to consistent information in a timely fashion across disciplines and agencies. In addition, participants indicated a need to network to share program and service information, discuss problems and concerns, and provide support for one another.

- Establishing intra- and interagency processes to identify effective services and programs for students (children and youth) at risk

  Common among responses throughout the state was the need to share information about effective interventions, strategies, programs, and services. Representatives indicated the need for determining effectiveness across disciplines as well as agencies. Appropriate utilization of resources can occur only by implementing effective practices. Programs determined effective in one category or discipline, may well be effective across a larger group. However, procedures have

not been developed and implemented to identify, validate, dissiminate, implement, replicate, and evaluate these across disciplines or agencies. This was expressed statewide.

- Review composition of regions within and across agencies

  Representatives interviewed expressed the need for organizations and agencies to re-examine the assignment of individual communities/counties to specific regions. Problems appeared to center around utilizing a geographic approach to alignment as the only criteria as well as a lack of alignment of regions across agencies. It was suggested that regions may comprise those communities that share a specific "problem." For example, some communities in Utah reflect a changing economy: tourism is becoming a lead industry. Common problems have emerged shared by these communities, although they are not geographically linked one to another. Another example expressed was that of geographically aligning small, isolated communities with larger, more urbanized population centers. Concerns reflected a lack of common concerns and lack of needed services due to central locations of larger numbers requiring attention numbers: can't compete for services.

- **EMPOWERING LOCAL EFFORTS**

  It appears that decisions made by those closest to the student (child/youth) and family are most effective.

  Representatives from across the state repeatedly indicated the need to solve problems, make decisions, and implement strategies with those closely involved with the student (child or youth) as possible. Keeping the focus on the child or youth was noted as critical by those participating in discussions. Those directly involved with the child or youth are in a position to bring needed information to solving problems, determining desired outcomes, and identifying needed resources. Parents and local staff representing the various disciplines, agencies, and organizations who are or might be involved in providing services are essential in bringing insight and expertise needed to develop and implement an effective service plan.

  - Promoting decision-making at the child/family level by freeing resources from categorical restrictions and empowering team/council representatives to commit them

    Representatives from effective site level teams and interagency councils repeatedly indicated that a major contributor to program effectiveness was the ability to determine what service was needed, secure the needed service, and follow-through by providing it. Responses included the need for expanding existing models, such as the Early Intervention Program (Kindergarten-Grade 3) to more sites.

- Bringing state level meetings to communities

  Representatives indicated the need to have training, inservice, and informational meetings provided closer to local communities. Travel to and from meetings consistently held in Salt Lake City or in regional centers means time away from service provision. In addition, large meetings, while effective in providing general information and program dissemination, often fails to meet needs of participants relative to unique problems and concerns. Regularly scheduled meetings at regional and community levels would provide a forum for problem solving and responding to these individual areas to all participants.

- Conducting more on-site program visits

  Responses indicated the need for state-level staff to visit programs and services in actual operation. On-site visits were discussed for purposes to include: identifying effective strategies and programs; sharing information across programs, districts, and agencies; providing staff recognition; keeping current with ideas and strategies; providing feedback to local teams and councils; and networking. It was stressed that these visits not be for compliance and regulation monitoring, but be programmatic in nature.

- Expanding support systems in communities

  Participants in the discussions indicated the need for accessible support services and systems. This area has been addresses earlier in this section, but it remains a critical problem: local communities and sites need more services and service providers to meet the needs of students (children and youth) and families. These support systems must not only be present, but they must be available in a timely fashion. Some areas report that needed service determined by a local team will require months of waiting for an appointment.

- Developing and implementing processes of identifying local interagency efforts, community needs, service gaps, and resources and provide needed assistance

  From responses across the state, it appears that there is a need to develop and carry-out a uniform approach to determining and reviewing local interagency efforts, needs, resources, and in providing responsive, unified assistance. In keeping with earlier identified needs for a unified, consistent message, it would appear that representatives of the various disciplines within agencies as well as across agencies would enhance local effectiveness by combing activities and efforts in this direction. With representation from various disciplines and agencies at the state level, specific local questions can be addressed directly, problems resolved, and decisions made in a timely, responsive order.

- Providing additional trained, competent, and caring staff

  Across all districts, staff were identified as the underlying component for effective strategies and programs. Not only is additional staff required for needed service provision, but ongoing training must be provided in order to assure competency and effectiveness at the student (child or youth) and family level. All indicated a need for dedicated and committed people.

- **SUMMARY**

  The need is apparent and the challenge is clear!

After completing the on-site visits and reviewing the data gathered, it is apparent that the needs of Utah's school children and youth are widely diverse and increasing. From the data summarized above, it is apparent that communities face innumerable and widely divergent challenges--many of which transcend the purvey of any one agency. Participants in the on-site visits shared knowledge, concern, and hope for the future. They indicated keen awareness of the status of their local children and youth, families, needs, resources, and the community as a whole. Representatives also reported active involvement in working across agencies to bring resources together in order to appropriately meet the needs of students (children and youth) at risk. People make the difference: individual to individual.

The challenge is to focus system efforts on working across disciplines and agencies to facilitate efforts of those providing services to the child/youth. The challenge is to be responsive to unique local needs and to provide the required resources. The challenge is to put children and youth first. The challenge is to focus on the child!

APPENDIX

UTAH STATE OFFICE OF EDUCATION
DESCRIPTORS OF AT RISK CONDITIONS/PROBLEMS*

Students with Family Related Problems

___Divorce/Separation
___Alcohol or other substance abusing parent(s) (active or recovering)
___Single Parent family
___Teenage parent
___Death in family
___Dysfunctional family management
___Family illiteracy
___Limited parental English proficiency
___Home language other than English
___Mobility
___Physical/sexual/psychological abuse
___Latch key children/adolescents
___Other_____

Students with Socio-Economic difficulties

___Culturally different
___Ethnically different
___Religiously different
___Racially diverse
___Gender difference
___Poverty
___Geographic location
___Migrancy
___Homeless families
___Homeless teens
___Runaways
___Other_____

Intrinsic (to student) diversity

___Chronic absenteeism and truancy
___Chronic behavior problems
___Mental illness
___Chronic health problems
___Dental problems
___Chronic underachievement
___Eating Disorders
___Fetal Alcohol/Addition Syndrome
___Drop-out (have dropped out)
___Potential drop-out
___Involvement with the court system
___Involvement with gangs and gang activity
___Giftedness/creativity
___Disabilities
___Lack of social competence/interaction skills
___Limited English proficiency
___Limited native language proficiency
___Low self-esteem
___Sexually active
___Social/emotional immaturity
___Suicide-prone
___Teen pregnancy
___Substance abuse
___Other_____
_____
_____

*Master Plan for Services for Students At Risk: From Prevention Through Remediation; August, 1988: Utah State Office of Education

DISTRICT AT RISK STAFF
QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION
1992-93 School Year

1. What is your district definition of a student at risk?
   What % of your students are "at risk?
   How do you identify students at risk?

2. From the list of Descriptors of At Risk Conditions/Problems attached, which have you identified as existing among the students in your schools?
   Which conditions/problems are of greatest concern to your district?
   What is your district doing about those areas? Is what you are doing adequate? Is it working?
   Do you need to do something that you are not doing?
   What is standing in your way from doing what you feel you need to do?

3. In your opinion, what program(s) or services in your district would you say are doing an "outstanding job" with students at risk? Why? What populations are they serving?

4. Briefly describe how you have used the "at risk" flow-through funds in:
   1989-90
   1990-91
   1991-92

5. What will be the focus of your district efforts for the 1992-93 school year for the "at risk" population? How did you determine this focus?

6. How can we (USOE, At Risk Consortium, etc. help you and your district?

8/12/92

DISTRICT INTERVIEW GUIDE
SERVICES FOR AT RISK STUDENTS
1992-93 School Year

District Name _____ Date_____
At Risk Team Members: __Williams ___Hudson ___Wilcox ____Brand
___Kowalski Other_____
District Staff (Name/Position/Assignment)_____
_____
_____
_____

1. What is your district definition of a student at risk?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

1-1 What % of your students are at risk?

Overall _____

PreSchool _____

K-3_____

4-6_____

7-9_____

10-12_____

1-2 How do you identify students at risk?

_____ Formal Standardized Tests
_____ Informal/CBA Tests
_____ Grades
_____ Teacher Referral
_____ Parent Referral
_____ Other Agency

_____ Principal Referral
_____ Classroom Performance
_____ Academic Achievement
_____ Social Skills
_____ Behavior

District_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2-5 What is Standing in your way from doing what you feel you need to do?

_____ Staff
_____ Fiscal Resources
_____ Trained Staff
_____ Time
_____ Other

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2-6 When a student has needs that go beyond the classroom teacher's resources, what does that teacher do? Where does that teacher go for assistance?

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

2-7 When a student has needs that go beyond the resources of the school, what does the school do? Where do schools turn for assistance?

Comments:_____

_____

_____

2-8 Do specific program people in you district meet to discuss needs of students that go beyond resources of schools? Teachers?

District_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

2-8-1 How often do they meet?

Comments:_____

_____

_____

3-1 In your opinion, what program(s) or services in your district would you say are doing an "outstanding job" with students at risk?

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3-1-1 Why?

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

3-1-2 What populations are they serving?

District_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

2-4 Do you need to do something that you are not doing?

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

2-8-2 Who calls them together?

Comments:_____

_____

_____

2-8-3 Who attends?

Comments:_____

_____

_____

4-1 Briefly describe how you have used the "at risk" flow-through funds?

4-1-1 1980-90 _____

_____

_____

4-1-2 1990-91 _____

_____

_____

District_____

4-2-3 1991-92 _____

_____

_____

5-1 What will be the focus of your district efforts for the 1992-93

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

5-1-1 How did you determine this focus?

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

5-1-2 Were other agencies that serve "At Risk" students in your community involved in this decision?

Yes____ No____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

6-1 How can we (USOE, At Risk Consortium, etc.) help you and your district?

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

District_____

INTERAGENCY QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION
1992-93

1. How are services for "at-risk" children/students coordinated?
   How do you handle problems with a student or child when his/her identified needs go beyond your own agency's resources or capabilities?
   How do you all work together?
   Are there agencies that should be represented that aren't?
   Do you meet regularly?
   How are members selected to be on this council/team?
   Does your council address issues of policy?
   Does your council do "case management?"
   What helps you the most in working together?
   What barriers stand in your way from working together?

2. What is the definition of "at risk" in your community?

   Do your agency definitions agree across agencies?
   From the attached list of "At Risk Descriptors, in your which ones do you identify as being present in your community for the school-age population?
   Are there gaps in services for "at risk" children in your community? What are they?

3. Which "at risk" populations or areas do you feel your council/team is most effectively meeting needs?
   Why? What makes this so effective?
   Which "at risk" populations or areas do you feel your council/team is least effectively meeting needs?
   When a student/child has a need that goes beyond your council/team resources/capabilities, what happens then?
   When a policy needs to be changed/modified that requires action from a higher level, what happens?

4. What will you as a council/team be focusing your efforts on this 1992-93 school year?
   How can the USOE help you all?

FORMAL INTERAGENCY INTERVIEW GUIDE
SERVICES FOR AT RISK STUDENTS
1992-93 School Year

Council Name_____
District(s) Name_____ **Date**_____
At Risk Team Members:___ **Williams** ____**Hudson** ____**Wilcox** ___**Brand**
___**Kowalski** **Other**_____
Council/Team Members: (Name/Position/Assignment)

School District Supt./Designee_____
School District At Risk Director_____
Health Department_____
Juvenile Court_____
Division of Family Services Director/Designee_____
Mental Health Director/Designee_____
Division of Youth Corrections_____
Office of Social Services_____
Substance Abuse_____
_____
_____

1-1 How are services for "at-risk" children/students coordinated?

1-2 How do you handle problems with a student or child when his/her identified needs go beyond your own agency's resources or capabilities?

1-3 Do you have a formal interagency council/team?

1-4 Do you have a written interagency agreement?

1-5 How do you all work together?

1-6 Are there agencies that should be represented that aren't?

1-7 Do you meet regularly?

1-8 How are members selected to be on this council/team?

1-9 Can each member commit resources from your agency?

1-10 Does your council address issues of policy?

1-11 Does your council do "case management?"

1-12 How much time do you all spend in each area?

1-13 What helps you the most in working together?

1-14 What barriers stand in your way from working together?

1-15 Education has funds for providing services for "at risk" students, do you have input on how these funds might be used?

2-1 What is the definition of "at risk" in your community?

2-2 Do your agency definitions agree across agencies?

2-3 From the attached list of "At Risk Descriptors, in your which ones do you identify as being present in your community for the school-age population?

2-4 Are there gaps in services for "at risk" children in your community? What are they?

3-1 Which "at risk" populations or areas do you feel your council/team is most effectively meeting needs?

3-2 Why? What makes this so effective?

3-3 Which "at risk" populations or areas do you feel your council/team is least effectively meeting needs?

3-4 What is preventing your council/team from meeting these needs?

3-5 When a student/child has a need that goes beyond your council/team resources/capabilities, what happens then?

3-6 When a policy needs to be changed/modified that require action from a higher level, what happens?

4-1 What will you as a council/team be focusing your efforts on this 1992-93 school year?

4-2 How can the USOE help you all?

INFORMAL INTERAGENCY INTERVIEW GUIDE
SERVICES FOR AT RISK STUDENTS
1992-93 School Year

Council Name_____
District(s) Name_____ **Date**_____
At Risk Team Members:___ **Williams** ___**Hudson** ____**Wilcox** ___**Brand**
___**Kowalski** **Other**_____
Council/Team Members: (Name/Position/Assignment)

School District Supt./Designee_____
School District At Risk Director_____
Health Department_____
Juvenile Court_____
Division of Family Services Director/Designee_____
Mental Health Director/Designee_____
Division of Youth Corrections_____
Office of Social Services_____
Substance Abuse_____
_____
_____

1-1 How are services for "at risk" students/children coordinated in your community?

1-2 How do you handle problems with a student or child when his/her identified needs go beyond your own agency's resources or capabilities?

1-3 How do you all work together?

1-4 Do you meet regularly?

1-5 Who provides the leadership for this effort?

1-6 What helps you the most in working together?

1-7 What barriers stand in your way from working together?

1-8 Are there agencies you feel you'd like to meet with that you don't? Why?

1-9 Education has funds for providing services for "at risk" students, do you have input on how these funds might be used?

2-1 What is the definition of "at risk" in your community?

2-2 Do your agency definitions agree?

2-3 From the attached list of "At Risk Descriptors, in your which ones do you identify as being present in your community for the school-age population?

3-1 Which "at risk" populations or areas do you feel you are most effective in meeting needs?

3-2 Why? What makes this so effective?

3-3 Which "at risk" populations or areas do you feel are least effective in meeting needs?

3-4 What stands in the way of meeting these needs?

3-5 When a student/child has a need that goes beyond your community resources/capabilities, what happens then?

3-6 When a policy needs to be changed/modified that requires action from a higher level, what happens?

3-7 Are there gaps in services your community provides to "at risk" students? What are they?

4-1 What help we, USOE, give you?

Interagency At Risk Characteristics List

Ident.

___Family Related Problems
___Divorce/Separation
___Alcohol/substance abusing paren
___Single parent family
___Teenage parent
___Death in family
___Dysfunctional family managem
___Family illiteracy
___Limited parental English profici
___Home language other than Eng
___Mobility
___Foster care
___Custodial care
___Physical/sexual/psychological ab
___Latch key children/adolescents
___Other_____
_____

Socio-Economic difficulties

___Culturally different
___Ethnically different
___Religiously different
___Racially diverse
___Gender difference
___Poverty
___Geographic location
___Migrancy
___Homeless families
___Homeless teens
___Runaways
___Other_____
_____

Intrinsic (to student) diversity

___Chronic absenteeism and truancy
___Chronic behavior problems
___Mental illness
___Chronic health problems
___Dental problems
___Chronic underachievement
___Eating Disorders
___Fetal Alcohol/Addiction Syndrome
___Drop-out (have dropped out)
___Potential drop-out
___Involvement with the court system
___Involvement with gangs and gang activity
___Giftedness/creativity
___Disabilities
___Lack of social competence/interaction skills
___Limited English proficiency
___Limited native language proficiency
___Low self-esteem
___Sexually active
___Social/emotional immaturity
___Suicide-prone
___Teen pregnancy
___Substance abuse
___Other_____
_____
_____

Gaps	Most Eff	Least Eff	Focus